

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9-19 are pending in the current application. Claims 1-6 and 9-19 are amended. Claims 7 and 8 are canceled.

I. Drawings:

The drawings are objected to because the “X” measurement, in Figs 1 and 4 are not explained. The Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would understand that “X,” as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 4, refers to the installation depth of the busbars 22 and 30. Further, paragraph [0019] is amended to reflect the “X” measurement.

In light of the amendment to the specification, the Applicants respectfully request the objections to FIGS. 1 and 4 be withdrawn.

II. Claim Objections:

Claims 1-6 and 9-19 are objected to because of the following informalities.

The Examiner asserts the scope of claim 1 is indefinite because there is an inconsistency within in the claim. The claims initially indicated that the subcombination, a circuit breaker, is being claimed. Later, the claim contains positive limitations directed toward the busbars to which the circuit breaker is connected, suggesting that Applicant intends to claim the combination of the circuit breaker and the busbars. Applicant is required to clarify what subject matter the claim is intended to be drawn to and the language of the claim must be amended to be consistent with this intent.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify a system including first and second busbars, as well as the low-voltage power circuit breaker is being claimed.

The Examiner asserts there appears to be no difference between claims 2 and 3. Although having different names (and references numerals) in the claims, the accommodating regions 20 and the contact region 38 are the same part. This is reinforced in the figures where the numerals 20 and 38 indicate the same part.

Applicants have amended claim 3 to include additional features not included in claim 2. Further, the replacement drawings clearly illustrate 20 represents an accommodating regions, whereas 38 represents a contact region.

Similarly, the Examiner asserts claims 11, 14 and 17 are redundant in view of claims 10, 13 and 16. Claims 5 and 13-15 lacks antecedent basis for “the form.” The claims tend to be narrative and do not clearly define structure.

Applicants have amended the claims in an attempt to address both the antecedent issues and objected to narrative from of the claims.

As discussed above, Applicants have amended claims 1-6 and 9-19 and drawings 1-4 to overcome the Examiner’s objections. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the objection of claims 1-6 and 9-19 be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-6 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,837,950 to Horikawa (Horikawa) in view of US 3,474,206 to Gryctko (Gryctko). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Horikawa describes an arrangement including a drawer type circuit breaker (1), a first busbar (10) and a second busbar (11). The drawer type circuit breaker includes a first contact arrangement (5,6) for connecting a stationary contact (16) to first busbar, and a second contact arrangement (3,7) for connecting an opposing contact (15), arranged on a contact lever, to the second busbar. Horikawa’s busbars ***are connected with brackets, the brackets including at least one contact*** region by which the busbars are permanently arranged on a withdrawable part rack (8,9) or the low-voltage power circuit breaker. Horikawa discloses busbars having a side which faces the low-voltage power circuit breaker, and the brackets including at least one accommodating region for at least one retaining device by which the busbars via the brackets are permanently locked on the withdrawable part rack of the low-voltage power circuit breaker so as to form the low-voltage power circuit breaker as a withdrawable circuit breaker.

However, Horikawa fails to disclose that **“the busbars are permanently arrangeable on the outside of the low-voltage power circuit breaker”** via the side which faces the low-voltage power circuit breaker as recited in claim 1. Further, Horikawa fails to disclose that the busbars are **“permanently lockable”** on the withdrawable part rack of the low-voltage power circuit breaker so as to form the low-voltage power circuit breaker as a withdrawable circuit breaker or **“on the outside of the low-voltage power circuit breaker so as to form the low-voltage power circuit breaker as a permanently installed circuit breaker”** via the

accommodating region for at least one retaining device as recited in claim 1. These features are not obvious to a skilled person when considering the disclosure of Horikawa.

Gryctko describes an arrangement including a plug-in circuit breaker (10), a first busbar (12, 14, 16) and a second bus bar (52, 48, 50). The plug-in circuit breaker includes a first contact arrangement (20, 25, 24, 26) for connecting a first contact to the first busbar, and a second contact arrangement (42, 44, 46) for connecting an opposing contact to the second busbar. The busbars are permanently arranged on a withdrawable part rack (72) of the low-voltage power circuit breaker, and the busbars have a side which faces the low-voltage power circuit breaker.

However, Gryctko, like Horikawa, fails to disclose that "the busbars are permanently arrangeable on the outside of the low-voltage power circuit breaker" via the side which faces the low-voltage power circuit breaker as recited in claim 1. Further, Gryctko fails to disclose that the bus bars are "permanently lockable" on the withdrawable part rack of the low-voltage power circuit breaker so as to form the low-voltage power circuit breaker as a withdrawable circuit breaker or on the outside of the low-voltage power circuit breaker so as to form the low-voltage power circuit breaker as a permanently installed circuit breaker" via the accommodating region for at least one retaining device as recited in claim 1. These features are not obvious of a skilled person when considering the disclosure of Gryctko.

The above features are not obvious for a skilled person when considering the disclosure of Horikawa itself or Horikawa in view of Gryctko because both show a circuit breaker, where the busbars are connected only to the withdrawable part rack but not to the circuit breaker.

For the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 1, and all claims which depend thereon, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-6 and 9-19 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a two (2) months extension of time for filing a reply to the Office Action and submit the required \$460.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313
For P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/DMB/lo